БЕЛАРУСКІ КАЛЕГІЮМ

Belarusian Collegium

HOMO HISTORICUS 2016

The Annual of Anthropological History

Edited by Aliaksandr Smalianchuk,
Doctor in History

БЕЛАРУСКІ КАЛЕГІЮМ
Беларускі калегіум

HOMO HISTORICUS 2016

Гадавік антрапалагічнай гісторыі

Пад рэдакцыяй
доктара гістарычных навук Аляксандра Смаленчука

ISSN 2424-5216
ISSN 2424-5224 (Online)

Рэдактар
доктар гістарычных навук Аляксандр Смалянчук

Рэцэнзенты:
доктар гістарычных навук Захар Шыбека, Універсітэт у Тэль-Авіве;
доктар Рымантас Мікніс, Інстытут гісторыі Літвы (Вільня);
доктар гістарычных навук Аляксандр Краўцэвіч, Варшаўскі ўніверсітэт;
доктар хабілітаваны Ганна Энгелькінг, Інстытут славістыкі
Польскай акадэміі навук (Варшава)

Homo Historicus 2016. Гадавік антрапалагічнай гісторыі / пад. рэд. Аляксандра Смаленчука. – Вільня: Беларускі калегіум, 2016. – 222 с.

Homo Historicus 2016 працягвае традыцыі трох першых тамоў (2008, 2009 і 2012 гг.) з іх арыентацыяй на пашырэнне антрапалагічнага стылю мыслення ў аналізе мінулага. Большасць апублікаваных матэрыялаў датычыць феномену памяці ў самым шырокім яго разуменні.

ISSN 2424-5216
ISSN 2424-5224 (Online)

TROUBLESOME HERITAGE OF THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN COMMONWEALTH. POLISH POLITICAL THOUGHT TOWARDS BELARUS AND OTHER LANDS OF THE FORMER GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA IN THE ERA OF NOVEMBER UPRISING (1830–1831)[1]

Piotr Szymaniec
PhD in Law (Wałbrzych)

Рэзюме

Аўтар імкнуўся рэканструяваць стаўленне польскіх палітыкаў да спадчыны Рэчы Паспалітай і беларускай нацыянальнасці ў перыяд паўстання 1830–1831 гг. Асноўным элементам гэтай спадчыны, які актыўна абмяркоўваўся ў той перыяд, была ідэя палітычнага федэралізму. Яна была адкінутая як ліберaламі («Kaliszanie»), так і рэспубліканцамі («Stronnictwo Patriotyczne»). Яе прынялі толькі кансерватары, у т. л. прыхільнікі князя Адама Ежы Чартарыйскага, які, аднак, быў абвінавачаны ліберaламі і рэспубліканцамі ў спробе захаваць феадальныя прывілеі ў «гістарычнай Літве». Уся ліберальная партыя і частка рэспубліканцаў выступалі за цэнтралізацыю дзяржавы ў адпаведнасці з французскай мадэллю, якая азначала ліквідацыю самабытнасці Беларусі і Літвы.

Фармальны лідар рэспубліканскай партыі, вядомы гісторык Іаахім Ляляевель, выказваў розныя меркаванні. Выкарыстоўваючы канцэпцыю Уладзіслава Вяльхорскага, можна казаць пра ідэю двухузроўневай ідэнтычнасці, пры якой дапускалася існаванне польска-літоўскай і польска-беларускай ідэнтычнасцяў. Аднак такі погляд не быў пашыраны нават у партыі Лялевеля.

Можна сцвярджаць, што ў польскай палітычнай думцы часоў паўстання 1830–1831 гг. дамінавала ідэя цэнтралізаванай дзяржавы па ўзоры Канстытуцыі 3 мая 1791 г.

> Яна пагражала беларускай ідэнтычнасці, бо беларускія землі разглядаліся як неад'емная частка Польшчы, а беларусы ўспрымаліся як блізкія па свядомасці, традыцыях, мове і характары да этнічных палякаў. Гэтае меркаванне прысутнічала, напрыклад, у кнізе былога паўстанца 1830 г. Аляксандра Рыпінскага «Białoruś» (Paris, 1840).

Let us start with some facts. The population of the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania was surprised by the outbreak of the November Uprising. Despite this, the uprising in Samogitia started in March 1831. It covered an area of Oszmiana, Święciany, Wilejka, Dzisna and Lepel on the Belarusian lands. In the Oszmiana district, where a landowner Porfiry Ważyński began fighting, the colonel Karol Przeździecki commanded 2 500 soldiers. A total of about 10 000 soldiers came from the north-western lands of Belarus. However, the resistance of the insurgents was broken in May and the professional Russian army gained other areas occupied by the insurgents. The massacre of civilians carried out by the Russians in Oszmiana was a bloody episode of these battles. In May 1831, fighting, started with about 1 000 rebels gathered in the Białowieża Forest, broke out in the province of Grodno. Initially, the insurgent authorities in Warsaw very hesitantly supported the idea of expanding the uprising on the so-called "Ziemie Zabrane" ('Taken Lands'). In the relatively moderate proclamation of February 3, 1831, the Sejm urged the government to take steps in this direction. However, a small corps of over 800 people led by Colonel Dezydery Chłapowski were sent from the Kingdom of Poland to assist at the uprising and it entered the province of Grodno on May 10, 1831. The second and much larger body – comprising 12 000 people commanded by the general Antoni Giełgud – came in Lithuania at the end of May. After setbacks in the fight, associated largely with the incompetence of the general Giełgud, the Polish army crossed the Prussian border and placed their weapon there on July 13, 1831. In June and July, short-lasting military activities of insurgents still took place in the districts of Mozyr, Rechitsa and Pinsk. In turn, in the provinces of Mogilev and Vitebsk, part of the nobility tried to organize insurgent activities without much success. Belarusian peasants were a very small part of the insurgents, probably much smaller than during the subsequent uprising of January 1863. These peasants sometimes showed an openly hostile attitude towards insurgents.

Of a more egalitarian character was the uprising in the ethnically Lithuanian part in Samogitia, where – especially in the early phase –peasants actively participated, expressing their dissatisfaction with the prevailing feudal relationship on

this territory. The commanders, however, descended from the gentry. The November Uprising on the lands of Belarus, in which, as it is estimated, around 25 000 people could take part, was only the uprising of nobility, almost exclusively characterized by crystalized Polish national identity and mostly of Roman Catholic denomination[2]. However, as Aleksander Rypiński somewhat casually mentioned, lesser gentry, which had a strong sense of belonging to a former political nation, that is the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but was generally uneducated and spoke a mixture of Polish and Belarusian, shunned from participating in the uprising[3]. One may ask why the uprising did not, and probably could not, take another form. I think that the answer to this question is the contemporary Polish political thought, to a large extent.

In the Polish political thought of the November Uprising period, there occured a dispute about the character of the restored Polish state, regarding whether it would be a unitary or federal state. The dispute ran much deeper as it was related to the total political tradition of the First Polish Republic and ethnic groups inhabiting it, including Belarusians. The conservatives gathered around. Adam Jerzy Czartoryski believed that the so-called taken away lands, part of the territory of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth incorporated directly into the Russian Empire, after their liberation from the tsarist rule, they were to form a kind of federation together with Congress Poland (as a matter of fact, one of the daily newspapers of the supporters of Czartoryski was entitled "Orzeł i Pogoń"). Such federation would lead to maintaining, at least to some extent, previous social relationships in the area of Lithuania, Volynia and Podolia, different from the social relations existing in the Kingdom of Poland[4]. However, no other political party of the uprising period supported the federal model explicitly. The conservatives were accused of their desire to preserve feudal privileges of aristocracy and gentry on the territory of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania using the pretext of introducing a federal model of the state. It should not be forgotten that personal serfdom of peasants was abolished in 1807, but only on the lands that were incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland, where a sit was still in force on the so-called taken away lands.

The Liberal Party, the so-called Kaliszans, leading by the brothers Wincenty and Bonawentura Niemojowski, is proclaimed the view that the future state should be like France – the centralized and unitary state. Lithuanian and Ruthenian lands were to be part of the state created by one political nation: *"Without the borders to the Dnieper and the Dvina, there cannot be true Poland"*[5]. Within the extent to which the traditions of the Polish-Lithuanian Union were inconsistent with the desire to build a unitary state organism, they were negated by "the Kaliszans". The

Party clearly favored the tendency to unify the structure of the state which was launched by the Constitution of May 3, 1791. In the model of the state postulated by "the Kaliszans", there was no place for regional autonomy and the privileges of the propertied classes often associated with it. Therefore, "the Kaliszans" rejected the tradition of Polish-Lithuanian Union.

The main slogan of the republican party, the Patriotic Society ("Towarzystwo Patriotyczne"), was a "social revolution", basically meant just a desire to improve the situation of the peasants. The formal leader of this party, the eminent historian Joachim Lelewel, represented the views that by Władysław Wielhorski were named the idea of a two-tier consciousness, recognizing the Polish-Lithuanian and Polish-Belarusian identity[6]. In 1844, Lelewel pointed out that the concept of a Pole might include the inhabitants of Great Poland or Little Poland, the Kashubs, Mazurians, Lithuanians, Samogitians, and Ruthenians (the last of the mentioned terms meant the Belarusians and today Ukrainians). Of course, the names used by Lelewel may not be suitable for today's national divisions, but they relate to the regional divisions of the Commonwealth of Both Nations. The historian and politician, advocating the creation of the political and not ethnic nation, added that people professing different religions: Catholics, Orthodox Christians, Protestants, Jews, or Mohammedans, and using many languages: Polish, Lithuanian or "Rusyn" (Ukrainian or Belarusian), could be equally regarded as Poles: *"Do not distinguish the sons of Poland, who speak Ruthenian, Polish or Lithuanian language and who profess any religion, if they work with you in the name of the people, go together with them as their brother and accept them because the point is to go together"*[7]. Even during the uprising, Lelewel had the opinion that Poland meant nothing without the lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania[8].

Lelewel repeatedly expressed the view that the principles of the Constitution of May 3 – which went away from the tradition of the First Republic assuming ethnic and cultural regional distinctiveness – were wrong. Therefore, editing the answer adopted by the Parliament on February 3, 1831, on the behalf of the citizens of Lithuanian lands: Volyn, Ukraine and Podolia, Lelewel stressed the centuries-lasting Polish and Lithuanian relations and the heritage of the Union of Lublin of 1569. The quoted document called the inhabitants of these lands Poles, of course, not in the ethnic sense, but the political one. In fact, it recognizes all the citizens of the former Commonwealth as the members of one political nation. In the final part of the document the following words appear: *"We, the trustees of your will, promise and we warrant you making every attempt, so you may regain your rights. We do not want to dictate you any of them, you alone will cleanse your local Polish-Lithuanian customs, laws, institutions of arbitrariness of legislation, and as your needs will*

require and what your enlightened opinion deems convenient to improve. But you renew the ancient unity and union of the peoples with us; so we want you together with us to adopt a constitution for both nations and earnestly with us about the Polish crown decide to entrust it to the one who worthy of it will be"[9]. Thus, in the concept of Lelewel, the shared decision of the inhabitants of the lands of the First Polish Republic liberated from Russian rule was to determine the unitary or federal character of the reconstructed state. In the intention of Lelewel, adopted by the Parliament and implemented in a rather grotesque way in terms of the uprising which was losing momentum, the deputies elected by the citizens from the taken away lands were to complete the Parliament[10].

The arguments characteristic of Lelewel can be found in an anonymous article about the uprising in Volhynia and Lithuania published in "Nowa Polska" in May 1831, which was a journal ideologically bound with the Patriotic Society. The author (it cannot be excluded that it was Lelewel himself), citing the already quoted document of the Parliament of February of the same year, pointed out: *"In our opinion, developing political relations should be left to the citizens living there"*. From this perspective, he criticized entrusting general Józef Dwernicki, who conducted activities in Volyn, with *"the draft of law establishing political relations"* on these lands, the draft which was to be implemented after the removal of Russians from there[11]. In short, according to this author, "social revolution" on the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which should lead to the abolition of personal serfdom of peasants and their enfranchisement, was necessary, but it should have been done in a manner determined by the citizens of these lands. The citizens should have also been entrusted with the establishment of administration in the areas.

Such views were not universally accepted, even in the group of Lelewel. Many of his colleagues from the Patriotic Society assumed a position which was closer to that expressed by "the Kaliszans", nevertheless, some of them expressed it directly and fully only after the collapse of the uprising when they found themselves in exile. The vice-president of the Patriotic Society during the uprising, Tadeusz Krępowiecki (1798-1847), being an activist of the Polish Democratic Society in exile, strongly advocated the indispensability of centralization of the state in the model which was being implemented in France at that time. He believed that the federal nature of the Commonwealth, which lead to provincialism and "territorial egoism", was one of the causes of the partitions. He wrote: "centralization can be named the force or lever of the nation". As Krępowiecki explained, in France, despite the fact that "a mixture of different peoples" lived in this state, "everybody is called the French, they all have one nationality"[12]. Another activist of the Patri-

otic Society, Józef at Bolesław Ostrowski, discussed the same subject even more strictly than Krępowiecki. In 1835, he stated firmly that such a thing as a distinct nation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania did not exist. He categorically emphasized that waking of the sense of national identity in the inhabitants of the lands of Lithuania, Belarus and Ukraine is incompatible with the interests of the Polish nation, defined not in the ethnic but in the historical and political terms: "Restoration of Lithuanian and Ruthenian nationality is ridiculous, because it is rebellion against historical and political unity of Poland"[13]. It can be assumed that the views of Krępowiecki and Ostrowski expressed in exile are not fundamentally different from what they both thought during the uprising. This applies, in particular, to Ostrowski whose journalistic work from the period of the uprising clearly shows the fascination by the French model of the state in the version introduced after the July Revolution of 1830[14]. In this model, very little space remained to cultivate cultural identity of the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Warsaw, including the culture of the Belarusian population.

However, the tendency occurring in the Polish political thought during the uprising and after its fall, which supported the French model of the state, was not accepted uncritically. The creation of the Towarzystwo Litewskie i Ziem Ruskich ("Society of Lithuanian and Ruthenian Lands") under the leadership of Count Cezary Augustyn Platerin Paris, as early as in December 1831, proved that the opinions about the model of state among the émigré politicians were divided. On the one hand, the Society set itself the goal of promoting the civic, republican concept of the union between the inhabitants of Poland and the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania, different from the concept based on ethnic bonds. On the other hand, the Society protested against the tendency of Poles from Korona ('the Crown') to "appropriating" the tradition of the First Rzeczpospolita. However, the activity of the Society did not produce significant effects[15].

To understand the attitude of politicians and columnists of the November Uprising period towards the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania in general, and Belarusia in particular, the views on the culture of these lands need to be examined. Both in the period preceding the uprising and immediately following it, the Poles were not willing to recognize the cultural and national independence of the Belarusians whose national consciousness was just beginning to shape. Admittedly, the creator of the first dictionary of the Polish language, Samuel Bogumił Linde (1771–1847), recognized the existence of the Belarusian language, claiming that it is the everyday language of the population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, different both from Old Church Slavonic and Polish. Although Linde's position was not accepted, legal historians associated with the University of Vilnius,

Ignacy Daniłowicz (1788–1843) and Józef Jaroszewicz (1793–1860), both coming from the Greek Catholic families, defended the independence of the language in which the Lithuanian statutes were written. For them, it was the language of the former Lithuania – a Slavic country which, in a sense, they considered their homeland[16]. In contrast, the already-mentioned Joachim Lelewel, arguing against Linde, claimed that this language was merely an artificial chancellery language. Adam Mickiewicz also maintained for most of his life that the Belarusian language is just a dialect which is a mixture of Polish and Lithuanian, and he changed his opinion relatively late. Among Mickiewicz's friends, only Jan Czeczot (1796–1847) wrote in the Belarusian language and talked about it with care[17].

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, the views of the pre-romantic German thinker Johann Gottfried Herder, who indicated that the Slavic peoples form a community, and are characterized by a number of positive features, such as peacefulness, honesty, decency and hospitality, were more and more popular in Central and Eastern Europe. Herder postulated studying folk art because, as he claimed, true soul of the nation, being unsullied by foreign influences, could be found in folk songs. Adam Czarnocki (pseudonim: Zorian Dołęga-Chodakowski, 1784–1825) wanted to fulfill this demand when he arrived at the territories of Belarus in 1812 with the intention to provoke the peasants inhabiting these lands into armed resistance against the Russians. Similarly to some of the German pre-romantics, Dołęga-Chodakowski rejected the culture of the privileged classes – the nobility and the Church[18]. He argued that traces of ancient, pre-Christian culture, which he considered better because they were uncontaminated by feudal relations, were preserved in folk art that he highly valued (he wrote: *"There is no trace proving that before the era of our refinement [civilization] there were serfsin the North"*[19]). He also acknowledged the great importance of the Belarusian language (called by him a Krivich language, from the name of the East Slavic tribe, the Krivichi), which, according to him, initially dominated an extensive area covering Podlachia, Polesie, Smolensk, Vilnius region, the region of Pskov and Novgorod the Great[20]. However, Chodakowski, preaching the unity of the Slavs, did not formulate the thesis on cultural independence of the Belarusian lands.

During the uprising and soon after its collapse, very little was written about the inhabitants of Belarus. Lelewel mentioned them as one of the few authors[21]. Understandably, Samogitians who incited the uprising in March 1831 arouse more interest in the Warsaw press of the uprising time. In the article sent to "Nowa Polska", an anonymous author stated that, on the one hand, Samogitians linguistically were purely Lithuanian population, not subject to Polish and Russian influences. On the other hand, he added that they "were always righteous Poles", which

was also confirmed by taking part in the uprising[22]. He suggested, therefore, that the sense of belonging to the Polish nation expressed by Samogitians was political, not ethnic, and it was the commitment of somewhat higher degree than the ethnic one.

It seems that Aleksander Rypiński (ca. 1811– ca. 1886), an occasional poet, who himself took part in the November Uprising and, after its collapse, stayed in France and England as an expat, expressed view on Belarusian population in the book published in Paris in 1840 with the revealing title: *Białoruś. Kilka słów o poezji protego ludu téj naszej polskiej prowincii; o jego muzyce, śpiewie, tańcach, etc.* In the title of Rypiński's book, the words "our Polish province", referred to Belarus, draws our attention. At the same time, Rypiński does not define the concept of Belarus geographically. Therefore, it must be concluded that he used this name within its most commonly adopted meaning in the mid-nineteenth century, that is, the area covering the eastern half of present-day Belarus – the contemporary governorates: Vitebsk, Mohilev and part of Minsk[23]. The dedication placed at the beginning also needs to be considered significant because it expresses the same tendency towards unification which was preached in political discussions during the uprising.

Rypiński dedicates his book to *"the first Belarusian peasant who will first learn to read and, therefore, to speak and to reason in Polish"*, but he also adds that he does it *"in the name of the high praise and respect"* for such a representative of the common people (p. 5). In his deliberations, Rypiński proves that the Belarusians ("common people of the Slavic family") are close in terms of customs, language, and the nature of people to the Polish population (p. 18). This population feels, just like the Poles, animosity towards Orthodoxy. The Belarusian language "has its original feature" which distinguishes it from Russian and Ukrainian, and which, paradoxically, makes it similar to the Polish language (p. 21)[24]. Thus, in Ripinski's opinion, the Belarusians' difference from the Russians and Ukrainians in terms of language does not make them a separate nation, but it makes them vulnerable to the Polish influence (Rypiński pays attention on many differences in terms of grammar and phonetics between the Belarusian and Polish languages). This author suggests that, if properly enlightened, Belarusians would be a natural ally of the Poles in the fight against Russia. Rypiński's book ends with the call for an armed struggle for the liberation from the Russian rule, composed to the tune called "Kosciuszko march". This fight was to be the beginning of a new nation in the political sense, combining ethnic Poles and Belarusians: *"To arms! brothers! to arms! / Anyone under the Kosciuszko sign, / When he defends the country with his breasts: / At least he dies a Pole!"*[25] As even the quoted poem shows, in Rypiński's

view, a Polish element in the amalgam, which was to create the new nation, was clearly dominant. At the same time, Rypiński felt genuine fondness for Belarusian folk culture, which he described by numerous examples in his work.

As it can be assumed, Rypiński's views were shaped much earlier, probably during the November Uprising, as later he remained in exile[26]. It also seems that they are representative of the educated Polish gentry of Grand Duchy of Lithuania, both before the November Uprising and after it[27]. In turn, shortly afterwards, in 1845, the Vilnius author Ignacy Chrapowicki pointed out that Belarusians succumbed to the influences of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia, though they did not opt clearly on any of these sides. However, the publicist did not recognize them as a separate natio[28]. These views show why during the uprising Belarus was not seen in another way than in terms of the Polish province, and the population of the Belarusian lands were seen as the Poles unaware of their political and national identity.

Summing up, it must be specified that the heritage of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, accenting a federal state model, was troublesome for most streams of Polish political thought of the period of the November Uprising. The Liberal Party and part of the Patriotic Society (Republican party) were in favor of building a unitary state with a centralized administration based on French patterns. However, Joachim Lelewel, the president of the Patriotic Society, presented a different vision of relations between nations or ethnic communities, which were to form a resurgent Kingdom of Poland, as he acknowledged the possibility of the occurrence of a multi-level identity. By contrast, conservatives who advocated a federal model did not obtain social support for their concepts because, in the public opinion, there was a strong belief that their true intention was to maintain the *status quo* of nobility and aristocracy. It can be argued that the Polish thought of this period was the continuation of the idea of centralization of the state, which was initiated by the Four-Year Sejm in the years 1788–1792 and the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Centralization was recognized by many Polish writers and political thinkers as necessary to build a modern state apparatus and to modernize the social structure. In contrast, federalism was considered to be an obstacle in achieving these goals. If this idea was introduced into the implementation phase, it could jeopardize the future of the Belarusian identity. Such a conclusion is suggested by the fact that, among the Polish political class, the Belarusian lands were commonly considered an integral component of Poland, and the Belarusian population was perceived – as a participant of the November Uprising, Aleksander Rypiński, later wrote – as close in terms of customs and language to the ethnically Polish population. It

should be noted, however, that a contemporary Polish scholar Andrzej Walicki is right, when he highlights in the numerous studies that until the era of romanticism, inclusively, the Polish political thought focused on the political meaning of the nation. Such an understanding of the nation was used essentially by all currents of a political thought of the uprising period, though, the representatives of these trends also talked about a common language and culture as elements uniting the nation. Thus, some of the reminiscences of the Herderian, ethnic notion of the nation, also appeared in this thought. The tendencies to approve the unitary state model, which appeared in the Polish political thought of the period of the November Uprising, were not isolated. It is worth adding that only a few years earlier, the Decembrists opted for the introduction of the Russian centralized administration based on the French model, leading to lessening the ethnic differences within the state[29]. The aspirations for subordination of the Belarusian people and other inhabitants of the former Lithuania to one state culture that were expressed by both the Russians and the Poles, were provoked by the fact that, till the end of the nineteenth century, the majority of the Belarusians (especially the peasantry) – just like other ethnic groups of historical Lithuania – did not have a well-developed national identity[30].

Endnotes

1. This paper was presented at the Fourth International Congress of Belarusian Studies, Kaunas, Lithuania, October 3–5, 2014.
2. Pamiętnik Onufrego Jacewicza // Pamiętniki o powstaniu Litwy i ziem ruskich w roku 1831, ed. by F. Wrotnowski. Part II. Issue 1, Paris, 1833. S. 6; Zbiór pamiętników o powstaniu Litwy w 1831 roku, edited by F. Wrotnowski. Leipzig, 1875. S. 189–200; Dangel S. Rok 1831 na Mińszczyźnie. Warszawa, 1925. S. 9–70; Łatyszonek O., Mironowicz E. Historia Białorusi od połowy XVIII do końca XX wieku. Białystok, n.d. S. 77–79; Chłapowski D. Pamiętniki. Część II. Wojna roku 1830–1831. Poznań, 1899. S. 52–111; Szybieka Z. Historia Białorusi 1795–2005. Lublin, 2002. S. 56–60; Wróbel P. Kształtowanie się białoruskiej świadomości narodowej a Polska. Warszawa, 1990. S. 9–13; Kosman M. Historia Białorusi. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków–Gdańsk, 1979. S. 211.
3. Rypiński A. Białoruś. Paris, 1840. S. 200–201. Rypiński presented almost a caricature portray of the Polish-Belarusian lesser nobility.
4. See the statement of Aleksander Wielopolski – Posiedzenie Izby Poselskiej z dnia 7 maja 1831 r. // Dyaryusz Sejmu z r. 1830–1831. Tom III. Od 19 kwietnia do 25 maja 1831. Kraków, 1909. S. 328–332.
5. Posłowie na sejm z zabranego kraju. Niektóre pretensje // Kuryer Polski, Nr 555, July 3, 1831. S. 915.

6 Wielhorski W. Stosunki narodowościowe, wyznaniowe i językowe w W. Ks. Litewskim // Dzieje Ziem Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Cykl wykładów. London, 1953. S. 238–240.

7 Komitet Narodowy Polski do ludu Polskiego // Lelewel J. Mowy i pisma polityczne. Dzieło pośmiertne przypiskami pomnożone i wydane przez E. Rykaczewskiego. Poznań, 1864. S. 437–438; Jagiełło M. Narody i narodowości. Przewodnik po lekturach. Tom I. Warszawa, 2010. S. 15–16; Stanley J. D. Joachim Lelewel (1786–1861) // Brock P., Stanley J.D., Wróbel P.J. (eds.). Nation and History. Polish Historians from the Enlightenment to the Second World War. Toronto–Buffalo–London, 2006. S. 66–67; Skurnowicz J.S. Romantic Nationalism and Liberalism: Joachim Lelewel and the Polish National Idea. New York, 1981. S. 93–94.

8 Lelewel J. List do Leonarda Chodźki z 4 września 1831 r. // Lelewel J. Dzieła. Vol. I: Materiały autobiograficzne. Warszawa, 1957. S. 363.

9 Odpowiedź sejmu na adres obywateli ziem litewskich, Wołynia, Ukrainy, Podola // Lelewel J. Mowy i pisma polityczne… S. 75–76.

10 Lelewel J. Pamiętnik z roku 1830–1831. Warszawa, 1924. S. 130, 151.

11 O powstaniu na Wołyniu i w Litwie // Nowa Polska, Nr 117, May 2,1831. S. 3.

12 Krępowiecki T. Narodowość (Centralizacja) // Postęp, 1834, Nr 6. S. 84–85; qtd. in: Jagiełło M. Narody i narodowości. Przewodnik po lekturach. Tom I. S. 15.

13 Ostrowski J.B. Czy jest jaka Litwa? // Nowa Polska, 1835, Vol. 3. S. 352; qtd. in: Jagiełło M. Narody i narodowości. Przewodnik po lekturach. Tom I. S. 15.

14 It isproved, amongothers, by the article: O władzy Sejmu // Nowa Polska, Nr 40, February 13, 1831. S. 2–3; Nr 42, February 15, 1831. S. 2–3; Nr 44, February 17, 1831. S. 3–4.

15 Nowak A. Emigracyjne Towarzystwo Litewskie i Ziem Ruskich (1831–1833): w laboratorium rozpadu «przednowoczesnego» narodu Rzeczypospolitej // Brus A. (ed.). Życie jest wszędzie… Ruchy społeczne w Polsce u Rosji do II wojny światowej. Zbiór materiałów z konferencji 16–17 września 2003 r. Warszawa, 2005. S. 123–146.

16 The views on the history of Lithuanian law and the impact of Roman law on the former Polish and Lithuanian law, being a matter of a dispute initiated by Adam Naruszewicz, were concluded by Daniłowicz in the article: Historischer Blick auf das Litauische Statut und den Einfluss des römischen Rechts auf das polnische und litausche // Dorpater Jahrbücher, 1834, Nr 4–6.

17 Łatyszonek O., Mironowicz E. Historia Białorusi… S. 61–63. See also: Mickiewicz A. Wykłady paryskie o literaturze słowiańskiej // Mickiewicz A. Dzieła. Vol. VIII. Warszawa, 1955. S. 106.

18 Poppe A. U źródeł postępowej historiografii szlacheckiego rewolucjonizmu – Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski // Kwartalnik Historyczny, 1955, Nr 2. S. 13–35; Maślanka J. Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski. Jego miejsce w kulturze polskiej i wpływ na polskie piśmiennictwo romantyczne, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków, 1965. S. 29–32.

19 Dołęga-Chodakowski Z. O Słowiańszczyźnie przed chrześcijaństwem // Z. D. Chodakowskiego. O Słowiańszczyźnie przed chrześcijaństwem i W. Surowieckiego zdanie o piśmie temże z dodaniem krótkiej wiadomości o Chodakowskim i korespondencyi jego. Kraków, 1835. S. 4.

[20] Łatyszonek O., Mironowicz E. Historia Białorusi… S. 62; Do Łukasza Gołębiowskiego. Nowogród, 12 XIII 1820 // Z.D. Chodakowskiego. O Słowiańszczyźnie przed chrześcijaństwem oraz inne pisma i listy. Warszawa, 1967. S. 311–312.

[21] Mowa na obchodzie pierwszej rocznicy rewolucyi listopadowej miana w Paryżu 29 listopada 1831 roku; Mowa na obchodach rocznicy powstania Litwy i ziem Ruskich miana w Paryżu 25 marca 1832 roku // Lelewel J. Mowy i pisma polityczne… S. 89, 118–122.

[22] O Żmudzi. Artykuł nadesłany // Nowa Polska, Nr. 107, April 22, 1831. S. 4. The style of the article, containing numerous historical facts, resembles Lelewel's writing.

[23] Radzik R. Kim są Białorusini? Toruń, 2003. S. 43–44; Radzik R. Między zbiorowością etniczną a wspólnotą narodową. Lublin, 2000. S. 172.

[24] See also: Jagiełło M. Narody i narodowości. Przewodnik po lekturach. Tom I. Warszawa, 2010. S. 17; Radzik R. Między zbiorowością etniczną a wspólnotą narodową. S. 210.

[25] Rypiński A. Białoruś. S. 228 (the emphasis is original).

[26] Even the poem Do pułkownika Krystyna Lacha Szyrmy proves that the beliefs of Rypiński did not undergo major changes since then. Radwan Rypiński A. Kilka pieśni okolicznościowych. London, 1857. S. 11–15.

[27] Radzik R. Między zbiorowością etniczną a wspólnotą narodową. S. 210–211. Differently: Barszczewski A. Wstęp // Antologia poezji białoruskiej, selected by J. Huszcza. Wrocław–Kraków, 1978. S. X.

[28] Sadowski L. Polacy i Białorusini: stereotyp nieantagonistycznego współistnienia // Maciejewski J. (ed.). Przemiany formuły polskości w drugiej połowie XIX wieku. Warszawa, 1999. S. 261–262.

[29] Пестель П. Русская Правда // www.samomudr.ru/d/Pestel'%20P.I.%20_Russkaja%20pravda.pdf [28.02.2015].

[30] Wróbel P. Kształtowanie się białoruskiej świadomości narodowej a Polska. S. 17–20; Radzik R. Kim są Białorusini? S. 12–15, 20–24.